

**REMARKS**

Claims 2-9 and 11-40 are pending in this Application. Claims 3, 4, 6-9, 12 and 14-40 stand withdrawn. By this amendment, claims 2 and 11 are amended. Support for the amendments can be found, for example, in original claim 1. No new matter is added. Reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

**I. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter**

The Office Action rejects claims 2, 5, 11 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a/e) over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0085599 to Kim. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Kim fails to disclose each and every feature recited in claim 2. For example, Kim fails to disclose “projecting a laser beam for reproduction having the same projection condition as that of the reference beam is projected onto the deposited holographic recording layers so as to generate a diffraction beam in an upper holographic recording layer and to make a transmitted 0-th order diffraction beam be projected onto a lower holographic layer one by one,” as recited in claim 2. As discussed above, Kim discloses a holographic recording medium 240 having two recording layers  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  onto which lasers  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  are projected, respectively (see Kim, Fig. 2A). The laser beams projected on the deposited holographic recording layers generate diffraction beams (see Kim, Figs. 2A and 3A). However, the diffraction beam generated in the upper holographic recording layer  $L_2$  does not make a transmitted 0-th order diffraction beam be projected onto the lower holographic recording layer  $L_1$  as recited in claim 2.

Therefore, claim 2 is patentable over Kim.

Claim 11 recites that “the reproducing laser optical system is configured to make a laser beam for reproduction be projected onto the deposited holographic recording layers with the same projection condition as that of the reference beam so as to generate a diffraction

beam in an upper holographic recording layer and to make a transmitted 0-th order diffraction beam be projected onto a lower holographic layer one by one." Therefore, claim 11 is also patentable over Kim at least for the reasons discussed above for Kim, as well as for the additional feature claim 11 recites.

Claims 5 and 13 depend from independent claims 2 and 11, respectively. Therefore, these claims are also patentable at least for their dependence from independent claims 2 and 11, as well as for the additional features these claim recite.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

## **II. Rejoinder**

Claims 3-8, 12, 14-16, 36 and 37 ultimately depend from independent claims 2 and 11. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request rejoinder of those claims.

## **III. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Brian K. Kauffman  
Registration No. 63,199

JAO:BKK/jls

Date: February 9, 2010

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 320850**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p><b>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION</b> Please grant any extension necessary for entry of this filing; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--